A BRIEF

DISCOURSE

Concerning the

Lawfulness of Worshipping GOD

BY THE

COMMON-PRAYER.

Being an

ANSWER

To a Book, Entituled,

A Brief Discourse concerning the Unlawfulness of the Common-Prayer *Worship.*

Lately Printed in *New-England*, and Re-printed in *London*.

In which, the Chief Things Objected against the Liturgy, are consider'd.

The Second Edition Corrected.

Let all things be done decently, and in order. 1 Cor. 14. 40.

LONDON:

Printed for Mr. Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, MDC XCIV.

IMPRIMATUR,

August 9. 1693. GEO. ROTSE.

THE PREFACE.

HOW Pious or Learned the Author of the Book I undertake to answer may be, I am no more concern'd to know, than I am who the Author is, whom the Publisher hath thought fit to commend as such; and having so done, to conceal. But he is not (as far as I conceive) the more Learned or Pious for Writing this Book. Not the more Learned; for by all the helps he professes to have had from Dideclavius, &c. he is guilty of many gross and palpable Mistakes: And not the more Pious, because of the uncharitable Reflections and Inferences he every where makes. For would any man of a truly Christian Temper alledge these things now against the Common-Prayer, which were alter'd or expunged above thirty years before he published his Brief Discourse? Or charge us with violating the Word of God, because we change the word Sabbath for the Seventh Day, or say that we sacrilegiously steal from it, because Hallelujah, or Praise the Lord, is sometimes left out in the Reading-Psalms; or that we equal the Apocrypha to, and set it up above the Canonical Scriptures, because it's read on the Highest Holy-days (as he saith, but not very truly) tho the Articles of our Church expresly declare them to be only of humane composition. Suppose now I should treat this Author after the same manner, and whereas he professes to have compared our Liturgy with the Missal, &c. I should take all advantages given in his Book, to shew, that notwithstanding this, he had never read them. I am certain, I could much more easily, and as Charitably do it, as he make good his aboveſaid Charge. For would any one conversant in the Missal, Breviary and Ritual of the Church of Rome, have said (as he doth, p. 5.) That *Beza* notes, that in the *Roman* Liturgy, men are taught to cry, *Jesu Miserere mei*, no less than ten times one after another? For what need he quote Beza for that which he has (as he saith) read himself; and which after all, Beza mistook, and he with Beza; or rather he mistakes Beza in; since the Jesu Miserere thus repeated, is not in the Missal, &c. but in private Offices of that Church. Who again, that had been conversant in our Liturgy, would have said, as the Author, Some have observ'd, that of 172 Apocryphal Chapters, but 38 are omit-

ted? *For what need he to be beholden to another's* Observation, *for what he that had thus read the Liturgy must have under his own eye? So easy is it to repay him in his own Coin, if we will reflect and infer after his way.*

It's a shrewd sign this Author was hard put to it to make good his Charge against the Liturgy, and to prove his Point, That it's unlawful to be present at the Common-Prayer Worship.

And after all, it's of little Service to our Author, and those of his Communion, to make such Exceptions as he has done; for if all things were alter'd and remov'd that he objects against, they of his way would be no nearer to us than they are, as the things stand at present; as long as we are a National Church, and have a Liturgy; and whilst they continue Independent and Congregational, are against the use of any Forms, even such as are Scriptural (as the Lord's Prayer and Decalogue;) nay, against reading the Scripture in their Publick Congregations.

Indeed he had dealt more sincerely, if he had acquainted his Reader, That they hold it unlawful to communicate with us, because we are a National Church; and that they don't joyn in the Common-Prayer Worship, because it's a Form, and all Forms are in his Opinion unlawful. This indeed had struck at the Root of all; but this he knew was not so easily prov'd, nor would look so popularly, as to cry out Heathenism, Judaism, *and* Popery, *which he charges our* Service-Book *with. This indeed will rouze the Adultitude; and it's no wonder when possess'd with this Representation of our Worship, that the deluded People broke into the Church (Erected at* Boston *for the Worship of God, according to the Church of* England) *to search for the Images they supposed we worship'd. The time was when the* Antinomians *from among themselves, treated them in the like way, and call'd them* Legal Preachers, Popish Factors, Scribes, and Opposers of Christ. *And they may remember what had like to have been the Effect of it, if they had not taken up what their Adversaries call'd a* Bloody Tenet. *And truly we had reason to fear it, if there had not been a Superior Authority to over-rule it.*

History of *Antinomians*, in the Preface.

But I shall forbear to recriminate, and shall leave the rest to the Book, where I have let nothing escape that requires an Answer; and I hope have given a sufficient Answer to it, and in the issue have prov'd, that (as far as his Exceptions go) they have no reason to forbear being present at, or joyning in the Common-Prayer-Book Worship; which is the Matter of the First Question: Nor that it's unlawful to take an Oath by laying the Hand upon the Bible; which is the Matter of the Second.

A BRIEF

DISCOURSE

Concerning the

Lawfulneſs of Worſhipping GOD

BY THE

COMMON-PRAYER.

THE Firſt Queſtion propoſed by the Author, is,

Q. *What are the Reaſons why you judge it unlawful to be preſent at, or to partake in the Common-Prayer Worſhip?*

The Reaſons he gives are four, taken,

1. *From the Original of the Common-Prayer-Book, which,* ſaith he, *with the Ceremonies and Worſhip preſcribed therein, I find to be in a great meaſure Popiſh and Heatheniſh.*

2. *From the Matter of the Common-Prayer-Book.*

3. *Becauſe Publick Liturgies of humane Compoſure, are an Innovation and Deviation from Primitive Purity.*

4. *In this Age of Light, it would be a great Apoſtacy in the leaſt to countenance or comply with the Common-Prayer-Worſhip.*

Theſe are the Reaſons he advances, and by which he endeavours to juſtify their continuance in a Separation from the Church of *England*, and the Worſhip therein Adminiſtred.

And theſe I ſhall take the liberty to examine.

For the clearer diſcourſing upon which, I ſhall divide what I have to ſay, into ſo many Chapters, *viz.*

1. Of the Original of the Common Prayer, or *Engliſh* Liturgy.
2. Of the Matter of it.
3. Of the Original of Liturgies.
4. Of Worſhip by a Liturgy.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Of the Original of the Engliſh *Liturgy.*

OUR Author ſaith, That *the Common-Prayer-Book, with the Ceremonies and Worſhip preſcribed therein, are in a great meaſure Popiſh and Heatheniſh*; and therefore it is unlawful to joyn with it.

This will be reſolved into two Queſtions.

Q. 1. Whether the Common Prayer be taken out of the Maſs-Book; and be Heatheniſh, as well as Popiſh?

Q. 2. Whether the being taken out of the Maſs-Book, makes it unlawfull to be uſed or joyned with, tho it be good and lawful in it ſelf?

Q. 1. Whether the Common-Prayer is taken out of the Maſs-Book? As our Author takes care to repreſent it, one would think there is little of the *Roman* Service left out in ours. *The Common-Prayer*, ſaith he, *is in a great meaſure Popiſh— is taken out of the Popes Maſs-Book—it cannot be denied it's derived from thence*, p. 1. *There is very little in the* Engliſh, *which is not to be found in the other*, p. 2. This is matter of Fact, and ſo is not to be determined by Authority. He himſelf makes a fair propoſal, which I ſhall accept of, viz. *Let ſuch as have any heſitancy about this matter compare the Popiſh Miſſal*, &c. *with the* Engliſh *Liturgy, and they will be convinced*, Of what? That he had never read and compared them; or is guilty of a notorious Abuſe that he puts upon his ignorant Reader, that after he pretends to have read and compared, ſhall aſſert ſo groſs a falſhood, and ſay, There is very little in the *Engliſh*, that is not to be found in the other, *&c.*

1. For there is little comparatively in the *Engliſh*, which is to be found in the *Roman* Liturgy, and far more is left out, than ever was taken thence. This is indeed directly contrary to what he affirms, and yet let any one compare them, and he will be convinced of the truth of it. Take that which is called *the Cannon of the Maſs*, or Form of Adminiſtring the Euchariſt, and there is no Agreement, not one Collect or Prayer the ſame. Go we to Baptiſm, there is not one Prayer belonging to that Office that is in ours. And as for the Litany, there is not a third part of theirs in ours, and much in ours which is not in theirs.

2. There

2. There is nothing in the Service of the Church of *Rome*, which makes it *the Popes Miſſal*, and is peculiar to that Church, that is in ours; that is, there is no Popery in our Liturgy. This he is in part forced to acknowledge. *There are*, ſaith he, *things (as Prayers for the Dead*, &c.) *in the* Roman *Liturgy*, *which are not tranſlated into* Engliſh. His *Et cetera*, if branched into particulars, would be very large, as he could not but know, if he had *read* and *compared* them. As for Example, Where are their Croſſings, Elevation, and Adoration of the Elements? Where their Solitary Communion, and Communion in one kind? Where their frequent Croſſings of themſelves, and of the Book? Where their material Croſſes, and the Adoration of them? Where their Prayers for the Dead? Where their Interceſſors, the Virgin *Mary* and Saints, that are to be found in the Cannon of the Maſs? Where are the many Exorciſms in Baptiſm, the Puffs they blow in the Infant's face, their Conjuration of Salt, *for a wholeſome Sacrament to the driving away of Devils*, that's put into the Mouth of the Infant, *as a propitiation unto Eternal Life*? Where the Spittle with which the Ears and Noſtrils of the Infants are touched with an *Ephphatha*, *be opened?* Where the *Oyl of Salvation*, (as it's call'd) wherewith the Prieſt anoints the Child's Breaſt and Shoulders in form of a Croſs? Where the Chriſm or Oyntment wherewith he anoints the Crown of the Head in figure of a Croſs? Where the change of Garments, their Purple and White Robe, that the Child is to *carry unſpotted before the Tribunal of our Lord?* Where the lighted Candle put into the Child's hand, that *when our Lord ſhall come to the Wedding*, *he may meet him*? Where the many Croſſings of the Head before Baptiſm, and of the Eyes, Ears, Noſtrils, Breaſt, Shoulders, Mouth, &c. to be found in their Ritual and Paſtoral? *Laſtly*, To go no farther, Where are the *O Holy* Mary, *Mother of God*, &c. *pray for us*? Where are the Angels and Arch-Angels, the Patriarchs and Prophets, the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts; the Martyrs, Popes, and Confeſſors, the Prieſts and Levites, the Monks and Hermits, the Virgins and Widows, the Forty ſeven Saints in particular, and all Saints in general, that are called upon in their Litany, *Pray for us*? And if nothing that is truly Popiſh be to be found in our Liturgy, we have ſo far reaſon to deny that it's taken out of the Maſs-Book.

3. I add, That our Service is ſo far from being taken out of the Miſſal, that whatſoever in it is the ſame with the Office in the

Church

Church of *Rome*, is moſtly taken out of the Ancient Offices of the Chriſtian Church. And becauſe every one cannot compare it, I will produce Impartial Authority for it. Thus ſaith Mr. *Ball*, a Nonconformiſt of great Note in the laſt Age, *The* Engliſh *Liturgy is not a Collection out of the Maſs-Book, but a refining of the Liturgy, which heretofore had been ſtained with the Maſs* ——— *and is not a Tranſlation of the Maſs, but a Reſtitution of the Ancient Liturgies.* So the Miniſters of *Old England*, in a Letter to the Miniſters of *New England*, wrote *Anno* 1637. *It's no hard task to ſhew, that our Service-Book was reformed in moſt things according to the pureſt Liturgies, which were in uſe long before the Maſs was heard of in the World*, p 2.

Trial of the Grounds of Separ. c. 8. p. 152.

To theſe I will add one more, for the Character our Author gives of him, *viz.* Biſhop *Jewel* (whom he calls *that great Light in the* Engliſh *Church*, p. 9.) Who ſaith, *We are come as near as poſſibly we could to the Church of the Apoſtles, and of the old Catholick Biſhops and Fathers* ——— *And beſides, we have aimed not only our Doctrine, but Sacraments alſo, and Forms of our Publick Prayers, after the patern of their Rites and Ordinances.*

To ſay the truth, it's a very odd thing to repreſent our Liturgy as Popiſh, when thoſe that compoſed and uſed the Liturgy, were burnt by the Papiſts for it, and when to this day they will not communicate in it, nor with the Church that uſeth it. Our Author ſaith, *There have been Jeſuits and Popiſh Intelligencers that approved of our Service, and Pope* Pius 5*th would have ratified it?* And is it therefore Popiſh? The Independent allows the Presbyterian Confeſſion of Faith; And this Author ſaith, p. 4. *It muſt be acknowledged that ſuch of the Church-of-*England*-men, as keep to the* 39 *Articles in matters of Doctrine, are as Orthodox as any Proteſtants in the world.* And is therefore the Independent a Presbyterian, or this Author a Church-of-*England*-man? I trow not. All is, that they agree in the Common Principles the other receives, and yet one is no more the other, than if they had no agreement in ſuch Principles. And ſo is it here, the *Engliſh* Liturgy has nothing but what is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and allowable by the Chriſtian Church; and therefore what the Papiſts will, or ought to allow; but for all that, we are no more Papiſts, nor that any more Popiſh, than the Independent is a Presbyterian, or our Author a Church-of-*England*-man. It was not then, becauſe it was Popiſh, that they approved of our Service, but that it was Chriſtian, and pure in its Order and Compoſure; neither was it becauſe

cause it was Popish, that the Pope would have ratified it, but because upon any terms he would have prevailed upon Queen *Elizabeth* to own his Authority, and regain'd her to their Church.

4. However I deny not, but that the Compilers of the Liturgy did peruse the Popish Offices, and take as much from thence, as was conformable to the Ancient Offices, and was fit to be used; and that the rather, that they might the more easily satisfie doubting or discontented Minds under the Alterations then made, and induce them to comply with them. And this was the meaning of King *Edward*'s Proclamation. A practice very Christian and commendable, and agreeable to the Apostolical prudence, which we read of, *Acts* 15. 16. 3. 1 *Cor.* 9. 19, *&c.*

And which the Nation soon felt the happy effects of, when by this excellent Conduct it became, generally speaking, Reformed. But yet after all, so little was taken out of the Mass-Book, *&c.* that they differ'd more than they agreed in, and more was left than taken out.

But our Author stays not here, *That the* English *Liturgy*, saith he, *is originally Heathenish as well as Popish, is manifest, 1. In that the Pope's Liturgy from whence ours is deriv'd, is so. The Principal Parts of the Mass-Book were borrowed from Idolatrous Pagans. They came from* Numa Pompilius, *p.* 4. *Ans.* It has been sufficiently made out by Protestants, that there is a great Affinity and Agreement between the Heathenish and Popish Rites; but our Author does an injury to the Argument, when affirming, that the *Principal Parts* of the Mass-Book, were borrowed from Idolatrous Pagans, he goes no further than *Vestments*, *Holy Water*, and *Incense*, as if these were the *principal Parts* of the Mass-Book, and the chief things that that agreed in with the Idolatry of the Heathens.

But this indeed is not to our purpose. Well! suppose there be this Conformity between the Papist and the Pagan; what is that to us, if we agree with neither? but that he attempts to prove.

For tho he cannot find *Incense* and *Holy Water*, and his *Et cætera* among us, yet he saith, *What Vain Repetitions does the Common-Prayer Book abound with? In one Service the Worshippers must repeat these words.* Good Lord deliver us. *Eight times over. And*, We beseech thee to hear us, *Twenty times over. The* Gloria Patri *is to be repeated Ten times in the same Morning or Evening Service. That the Heathens were wont to Worship their Idols just after the same manner, is clear from* Matth. 7. &c. *And* Beza *notes, that the* Roman *Liturgy does abound with them, wherein Men are taught to cry* Jesu, Jesu, miserere mei, *no less then Ten times one after another.*

For the better Resolution of which, I shall proceed in this order.

1. We grant, that there may be such things as vain Repetitions in Prayers, and other Divine Offices, for that is a fault our Saviour charges on the Heathens; and what we, as well as our Author, charge on the Church of *Rome*, and is also frequently charged by those that use and plead for Forms, on those that use extemporary Prayers.

2. We yet do maintain, That there are such Repetitions in Divine Worship, as are not vain, that are neither Heathenish or Popish. Such do we read of in the *Old Testament*, as, *Psalm*, 57. 1. 75. 1, 4. 5. 94. 1. 103. 1, 2, 22. 107. 8, 15, 21, 31. 136. *throughout*. And thus our Saviour repeated the same words thrice in his Agony in the Garden, *Matt.* 26. 44. and twice on the Cross, *Matt.* 27. 46. And consequently all Repetitions are no more condemned by our Saviour in *Matt.* 6. 7. than all long Prayers are, *Matt.* 23. 14. So that the vanity of Repetitions does not consist in using the same words eight times or twenty times in Prayer. For do we repeat in our Service, *Good Lord deliver us*, eight times: And *Glory be to the Father*, &c. ten times? And, *We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord*, twenty times? So we find, that they not only had their thrice, and their four times, but their twenty seven times in every Verse of *Psalm* 136. *His mercy endureth for ever*; which *Psalm* was most used on solemn Occasions, as we may find it, 2 *Chron.* 5. 13. 7. 3, 6. 20. 21. *Ezra* 3. 11. *Jer.* 33. 11. So that we may more truly say of the Church of God amongst the *Jews*, than he doth of the *Heathens*, and their Idols, that *they were wont to Worship* God *just after the same manner*, with Repetitions in their Service, as we.

3. We are to consider wherein the vanity of Repetitions consists, so as to be after the manner of the Heathens. This admits great variety, and just bounds cannot be set; so that it's not to be exactly said, Here the vain Repetitions begin. But they are such;

1. When they that use them, think that they shall be *heard for their much speaking*, as our Saviour saith, the Hethens did: Thus the Priests of *Baal* did, crying out, *O Baal hear us*, from Morning till Noon; and accordingly *Elijah* upbraids them, 1 *Kings* 18. 26, 27.

2. When it is nothing but Tautology, *viz.* a Repetition of the same words without new Matter; or of the same matter, but in different words. Such were the Verses of *Battus* the babling Poet. Such were the Hymns used often by the Heathens, in the worship of their Gods. Such are the *Jesu, Jesu*, &c. without Intermission, sometimes used in the *Roman* Church.

But

But when there are distinct Petitions, as when we say, *We beseech thee to hear us good Lord*, it's as lawful to close each after that manner, as it is to say *Amen*, which we find to follow every particular Petition, and was distinctly repeated for twelve times together after that manner, *Deut.* 27. 15.

5. Vain Repetitions, are when the words are thought sufficient, tho the Heart be not with them; but this may be common to any. So that tho there are Repetitions in our Service, as there were among the Heathen, and are in the Church of *Rome*, yet ours are not vain, nor such Repetitions as theirs, by reason of the matter only, if accompanied with the heart.

3. He saith, *Some of the most Learned Patrons of Liturgies produce it as an Argument for them, that the Heathens made use of Forms in their Idolatrous Worship*, p. 5. And so he makes this the difference between the Heathens and Christians, that the first used Forms, but the last prayed without them. As for the practice of the Christians, we shall have occasion to speak of it under another Head; neither shall I trouble my self with the Opinion of those *Learned Patrons of Liturgies*, he speaks of: But I shall take his Argument as it lies before us, which is, That our Liturgy is Heathenish, because we use Forms as they did. He might as well have said, our Liturgy is Heathenish, because we use words as they did; since it's no more Heathenish to use Forms than Words. If they had the use of Forms, it rather shews the sense that Mankind generally have of this matter; and that there cannot be too great a care taken of our demeanour in Divine Worship, according to the Direction of the Wise man, *Eccl.* 5. 2. *Be not rash with thy mouth, &c. for God is in Heaven, &c. therefore let thy words be few*, and well considered. But if the Heathens had Forms, so had the *Jews*, so had Christians, as I shall shew; and so Forms no more make our Worship Heathenish than Jewish. But of this afterwards. But supposing, that our Liturgy was (as he would have it) taken out of the Mass-Book; yet,

Q. 2. Will the being taken out of the Mass-Book, make that Worship, which is otherwise good and lawful, to become unlawful to be used, or joyned with?

This he affirms, and offers to prove after this manner,

It's a known maxim (saith he) Omnis honor Idoli est Idolatria. *He that shall put any respect upon an Idol, cannot be clear of the Sin of Idolatry; but the Mass-Book is an Idol. And he that useth a Prayer, or joyns with a Prayer taken out of that Book, thereby puts an Honour upon an Idol.—How then can we joyn in Prayers taken out of the Idolatrous Mass-Book, and offer them to the Holy God?*

in which there are Three things contained.

1. That the Mass-Book is an Idol.

2. That to take a Prayer out of the Mass-Book is a respect to an Idol, and is Idolatry.

3. That it's unlawful to joyn in Prayers taken out of the Mass-Book.

1. *The Mass-Book is an Idol.* This we may justly question, because an Idol is the Representation of some Divine or Beatified Object, and that is as such propounded and set up for Adoration; such are the Images of God and our Saviour, of Angels and Saints in the Church of *Rome*. But in this sense the Mass-Book is no Idol; there is no Prototype or Object it represents, nor is any such Adoration paid to it, as is paid to an Image, or a Crucifix. We grant as well as he, that the Mass-Book is *Idolatrous*, as it contains some things that are so, and is used in Idolatrous Worship: But it no more follows from thence, that it is an Idol, than that the Incense, Holy Water, or Vestments, are Idols, which are used when they say Mass. But supposing the Mass-Book for once to be an Idol, that we may proceed to the next question, *viz.*

2. Whether the taking a Prayer out of the Mass-Book, be such a respect to it, as makes the Prayer to be Idolatrous? To this I answer, That the Prayers taken out of the Mass-Book, and inserted in our Liturgy, are so far from being a respect, that it is a disrespect to it. For at the same time that some Prayers were taken out, those were rejected that were left behind, for the gross Corruptions that were in them; and by so doing, the Reformers as much testified to all the World their abhorrence of it, as the emptying of the House of the Goods and Utensils not infected by the Leprosy, and their forsaking it, was a plain declaration of its Pollution. So that if Prayers taken from thence are good, the using them when taken thence, is no Idolatry, and Communion in them no Sin, and no more unlawful than it was to use the Vessels that were carried out of the infected House.

But this is the main Question, *viz.*

Q. Whether that which has been used in Idolatrous Worship, may, if otherwise good and lawful, be used where the Worship is not idolatrous?

This he denies, and for it offers these Reasons.

1 *We ought not to name an Idol, but with detestation; much less may we offer it as Worship to God.* Psal. 16. 4. Exod. 23. 13. *Hos.* 2. 16, 17. P. 4.

2. *It was* Paul's *Judgment, that Meat once offer'd to Idols, should not be made use of,* 1 Cor. 10. 28. *Therefore a Service-Book offer'd to Idols ought not to used. For there is a parity of Reason.*

3. *God hath strictly prohibited his people all symbolizing with the Heathen in civil usages, because he would not have them imitate the Heathen* Levit. 19. 19, 27.—*especially in matters referring to the Worship of God. Hence they were prohibited going up by steps to the Altar.* Exod. 20. 24, 26. *to plant a Grove near the Altar,* Deut. 16. 31. *And to worship to the East,* Ezek. 8. 16.

Before I proceed to consider these Arguments in particular, I shall state the Case it self; for resolving of which, we may observe.

1. That there are things Idolatrous in their own nature, or by a standing positive Law, and so are always the same. Such is the Picture of God, and Worshipping by Images.

2. There are things that have been customarily appropriated to Idolatrous Worship, and the use of which in common estimation, has been accounted Idolatrous. Such was the offering Incense among the *Heathens*; and therefore the primitive Christians refused it, as an acknowledgment of their Worship; and the *Thurificati* were reputed Idolaters.

3. There are other things that are used as well in true as Idolatrous Worship, and are lawful in themselves; such as Time, Place, Habit, Posture.

The first is always unlawful, and makes the worship Idolatrous.

The second is not to be used where it has been thus appropriated, and thus accounted, during such an opinion of them.

So that it's the last of these that the whole turns upon; for after all the clamour he makes about Idolatry, and the charge he would fain fasten upon us, he can produce nothing that is Idolatrous amongst us, no Images, no Prayers to Saints, nor so much as any thing appropriated, or in common estimation so accounted; no incensings of Books or Images, no sprinklings of Holy Water; but it all amounts to this, that *Forms* and *Repetitions* have been us'd by Idolaters; that they had *White Garments*, and observ'd *Holy-days*; So *p.* 4, 5, 8. Which are things lawful in themselves (as I shall shew) and cannot be made unlawful by being us'd in Idolatrous Worship. For when Idolatry is not in the nature of the thing, but in the use, take away the use, and Idolatry ceaseth; and consequently it may be lawfully used where there is no Idolatry in the Worship, and no Idolatry in the use of it. And if it be not to be used, it's not because it's unlawful in it self to use it, but be-

cause

cause it's forbidden by God, as was the case among the *Jews*; or because of some circumstances that make it inconvenient and dangerous. Thus it was lawful to eat that Meat, which had been offer'd to Idols, when it was afterward expos'd to sale in the Shambles, or set upon the Table at an Entertainment; because it was thereby restor'd to a common use; when yet it was not lawful to sit at Meat in an Idols Temple, for that was to have fellowship in the Idolatry, *Chap.* 8. 10, 20. It is then no more Idolatry to use a White Garment, or a Temple, or observe a Day, or to use a Prayer that has been used or observ'd in Idolatrous Worship, or by an Idolatrous Church, than it was to eat Meat that had been offer'd to Idols. Purifie the Gold, and separate the Dross from it, and the Gold is not the worse for the Dross that was before mingled with it. Scrape the Walls, and cast out the infected materials of it, so that the House be freed from the Leprosie, and it might have been as well inhabited, as if it had never been infected, *Num.* 14. 41. (to make use of former Comparisons, *p.* 2*d.* and 3*d.*) and take the things lawful from the things unlawful, and they become lawful again, and may be lawfully used.

1 *Cor.* 10. 25, 26.

But saith he, *The Rubbish of the Leprous house was to be cast into an unclean place: And the Leprosie breaks out still; therefore we may have no communion with it.* p. 3.

But surely it's the same thing if we leave the House that is infected, as it is to carry away the Rubbish into an unclean place; else why doth he talk of leaving the Communion for the sake of the Leprosie of Idolatry? We grant the Church we left to be Idolatrous, there the Leprosie is; and therefore we left it; but we left the Idolatry with the Church, and let him prove there is any of the Leprosie of Idolatry in what we have taken out of it, and then he would say somewhat to the purpose; but that he is far from.

Let us however consider his Arguments relating to the general part. 1. We ought, saith he, not to name an Idol, but with detestation, much less offer it as worship to God.

I answer, 1*st.* The *naming* there forbidden, is the naming an Idol with respect; and indeed the addressing any Worship to it. So *Psal.* 16. 4. *Their sorrows shall be multiplied that hasten after another God; their drink-offering of Blood will I not offer, nor take up their name into my Lips:* That is, they might not name them by way of worship, nor offer Sacrifice to them.

2*d.* Where is there such a naming of an Idol amongst us? what respect do we give to his Idol the *Mass-Book*? what Saint do we adore?

adore? *But*, saith he, *The Prayers are taken out of the Idolatrous* Mass-Book. But what then, if there be nothing of their Idolatry in the Prayers that are taken thence; when such are taken thence they are no more Idolatrous than before they were taken into the *Mass-Book*.

2*d*. He saith, *It was* Paul's *Judgment, that meat once offer'd to Idols should not be made use of*, 1 Cor. 10. 28. *Therefore a Service-Book offer'd to Idols ought not be us'd. For there is a parity of Reason.*

I conceive he is much mistaken in the account he gives of the Apostle's *Judgment*, who is so far from maintaining *meat offer'd to Idols to be unlawful*, that he makes it a thing indifferent (as before); and what a person may with a safe conscience eat of without scruple, unless it be with respect to another's conscience that is thereby offended, as the Apostle determines it, *v.* 28, 29. Now if Meat offered to Idols might be eaten of, then a Service-Book that has been used in Idolatrous Worship may be lawfully us'd (when the things contain'd in it are otherwise lawful and good.) *For there is a parity of Reason*, as he argues.

3. He saith, *God hath prohibited his People all Symbolizing with Heathen*, &c.

We grant that God did prohibit the *Jews* all symbolizing and agreement with the *Heathens* in their Idolatry. That is not the Question. But,

1. Whether an agreement with Idolaters in what was once used by them in Idolatry, becomes Idolatry, or be unlawful because it has been so used?

2. Or whether what was forbidden to the *Jews* is forbidden to all People, And to Christians as well as they?

These we deny.

The first we deny as to the *Jews*, that every thing us'd in Idolatrous Service was unlawful to them; for he says, *The Priests of* Isis *used to wear Linnen Surplices*, p. 9. and yet such Linnen Garments were the Priests and *Levites* to officiate in. So Circumcision was used among the *Egyptians*, &c. and yet continued to be used among the *Jews*.

Again, we deny that what was in that kind forbidden to the *Jews*, was forbidden and unlawful to all. For,

1*st*. A great part of what they were forbidden, was with respect to the people that before inhabited the Land; with whom they were to make no Covenant, but were utterly to destroy them, their Altars and Groves, &c. Exod. 23. 32, 33. 34. 12. Deut. 7. 2, 3, 5.

2. They

2. They were a People very prone to Idolatry, and ſo were tied up by ſtrict Reſtraints and Penalties.

3. They both came from *Egypt*, where they had long convers'd with Idolatrous Service, and afterward border'd upon Nations violently addicted to Idolatry and Sorcery; and in ſuch circumſtances there were theſe Checks laid upon them; and an aſſimilation to the Cuſtoms of ſuch forbidden.

And all this was not from the nature of the thing, and becauſe all uſages of Idolators were unlawful, but becauſe of the circumſtances of people, time, and place: And if ſo, then we muſt leave the caſe of ſymbolizing, and no longer make it a Caſe of Conſcience, but of prudence and expediency; and ſo we are left to judge what is fit to be retained, and what not; what practiſed, and what not.

And here our Reformers ſhew'd their Prudence and Moderation, by what they choſe; when the Ceremonies were few; and what were the Ceremonies of the Ancient Church, rather than the *Romiſh*. When they choſe ſome, that they might not give offence to the Churches of Chriſt in other parts of the World; and yet retain'd no more, that they might not burden their own Communion. When the Offices they ſelected were agreeable to the Ancienteſt Offices of the Church.

So that there was no Reformation in any place, where ſo much temper was preſerv'd, and where the purity of Religion, and the Simplicity and ſolemnity of Divine Service were more regarded: that what was good was retained; what was noxious was purg'd out, and even what was ſuperfluous was exſcinded.

But this he will not allow.

For, ſaith he, *the uſe of ſuch a Liturgy doth harden the Papiſts in their Idolatry*, p. 4. So *the Liturgy came from* Rome, *and will perhaps lead thither again*. p. 18.

But, 1. How can ſuch a Liturgy *harden* them in their Idolatry, or *lead* thither, which has none of their Idolatry in it; and in which the Papiſts are expreſly charged with Idolatry? *Vid.* Rubrick at the Communion.

2. How can this harden them, or lead thither, which has been the means of baniſhing and keeping their Idolatry out of the Kingdom?

3. How can this *harden* them, or *lead* thither, when the Papiſts agree with our Author, *That it's unlawful to be preſent at, or partake in the Common-Prayer Worſhip*, and are excommunicated if they do?

4. How can this harden them, or lead thither, when there is nothing that the Papiſts more labour to poſſeſs the people with prejudices againſt?

But

But he adds, *p.* 4. *The* Jews *themſelves are ſcandalized by the Liturgy. It's a celebrated Saying among them, That the Chriſtians have their* Jephilleth *from* Armillus; *that is, their Prayer-Books from* Antichriſt.

At what are the *Jews* ſcandalized? is it that we have a Liturgy? So have they themſelves had of latter Ages at leaſt. And ſo the Author ſaith, *p.* 13. That he had *ſeen Liturgies written in the* Hebrew *Tongue.*

Is it that we receive our *Prayer-Book* from *Antichriſt*? Yes, ſaith he, and for this quotes a *Celebrated ſaying* of theirs. But is this the truer for their ſaying ſo? they ſay, it ſeems, that *Chriſtians have receiv'd their* Prayers *from* Antichriſt: but I hope that there are many Chriſtians in the World, that have Prayer-Books which they never received from the *Antichriſt* he ſpeaks of; So the *Greeks* and *Abyſſins*, &c. The whole is at leaſt a ſorry Miſtake, and which, for ought I ſee, he underſtands no more than we do his *Jephilleth*. The caſe is plainly thus; That the Rabbins ſay, that *Armillus* was to be a perſon of prodigious form, begot of a Marble Statue in *Rome*, and was to be the laſt Enemy of the *Jews*, and the Leader of the Chriſtian Forces againſt them; that he ſhould kill Meſſias *Ben Ephraim*, and at laſt be killed by Meſſias *Ben David*. That he ſhould give *Tephilleth* תפלותם, and a Law to the Chriſtians, which he and they ſet up in oppoſition to the Law of *Moſes*. So that we ſee that his *Tephilleth* is the Law as well as the Prayers of Chriſtians; and they make *Armillus* to be toward the end of the World, the laſt Enemy of the *Jews*; and how could our Liturgy, or the Liturgies now uſed by Chriſtians, be the Prayers received from *Armillus*, when *Armillus* is yet to come, according to the Rabinical Notion? if the Reader pleaſes he may have a fuller account of this *Jewiſh Garagantua* in *Buxtorf*'s *Lexicon*, *Chald. Talmud. Rabbin*; for I am weary of this trifling, and unintelligible Jargon.

CHAP. II.

Of the Matter *of the* Common-Prayer-*Book.*

BEfore I proceed to the particular conſideration of his Objections Relating to this Head; let me obſerve, that if we ſhould grant what he finds fault with to be blame-worthy; yet it's not to the purpoſe, and the point he propoſed; which is to give *Reaſons why he*

judges it unlawful to be present at, or partake in the Common-Prayer *Worship.*

And that for these Reasons. For,

1. There may be many things that are a reason against Ministerial Conformity, which will not be a reason against communion with the Church; since there are those things required to the one, that are not required to the other. Such is the Surplice, the Office for Burying the Dead, Marrying, *p.* 8. *&c.* which belong to the Minister, and not to the People: And therefore tho it should be unlawful to wear a Surplice, or use these Offices, yet since Lay-Communion is not concern'd in them, they are no reason for separation.

2. Many of his Objections are only directed against the occasional Offices, and so can be no reason against constant communion in the Daily office, or in those Offices in which they do not occur. As supposing what he alledgeth out of the Office of Burial, Marriage, Baptism, *&c.* to be true and sufficient, yet tho they may be a reason against being present at the Offices of Burial, Baptism, and Marriage, they are no reason against Communion, where those Offices are not concerned.

3. Things inconvenient, if not unlawful, are no reason for a separation, because then there could be no Communion with any Church, since no Church is without them: And if we should grant the reading a worse Translation of Scripture, and the *Apocrypha*, in the Church, to be things of that nature; yet it will be hard to shew them to be unlawful in themselves, and so to make it necessary to withdraw from the Church where they are used.

If these things be consider'd, most of what he has said will be prevented; but that I may not seem to avoid any thing, I shall take notice of the Particulars as they lie in order. And his Arguments taken from the Matter of the Service-Book, are

(1.) *Some things appointed therein are, in the judgment of sober and judicious persons, extremely ridiculous.* As how?

First, saith he, *How many odd and senseless Translations of the Holy Scripture have been found therein?* It's well, he said *have been found*; for he is fain to draw all his inferences of that kind, but one, from the *Service-Book*, as it stood before the last revisal, and that is *Psal.* 58. 9. *Or ever their pots be made hot with thorns, so let indignation vex them, as a thing that is raw.* At which he Triumphs, *What nonsence is this?* Now I do not think that to be Nonsence which is not soon understood; for then what will he make of the *Hebrew* in this Verse, which has several difficulties in it? But I think there is a good account to be given

given of the ſenſe of this Verſion; and that is, E're that the Pots are made hot with the Thorns, they ſhall be ſeverely puniſhed: The being made hot with the Thorns, ſets forth the ſuddenneſs; and the phraſe, *vexing a thing that is raw*, denotes the ſeverity of it.

(2.) His next Inſtance of *things extremely ridiculous*, is, that *in the Liturgy, the Writings of the Prophets, Acts and Revelations, are called Epiſtles.* If theſe were formerly, they are not now ſo called; but of theſe when read in the place of Epiſtles, it's ſaid, *The portion of Scripture for the Epiſtle.* That is, the Sections of Scripture read in that order, are generally Epiſtles; and ſo, as it's uſual in other caſes, gives the name to all: And as it is not now, ſo never was it called the Epiſtle of the Prophets, Acts, or Revelations; but the Epiſtle taken out of *Iſaiah*, &c.

(3.) He objects againſt the Reſponſes, *Thoſe broken Reſponds*, ſaith he, *and ſhreds of Prayer (as* Mr. Cartwright *calls them) which the Prieſts and People toſs between them like Tennis-Balls, ſeem extremely ridiculous to ſtanders-by.* Without doubt this is a venture of Wit; but I ſuppoſe there are *ſtanders-by* that will call it by another Name; and inſtead of Wit, term this ſcurrility in Converſation, and prophaneneſs in Religion; Eſpecially if we conſider how many Pſalms there are in Holy Writ, that are penn'd (or ſuppoſed at leaſt to be ſo, by Learned men) after this way. And whatever his *Standers-by* may think, there are Perſons of Piety ancient and modern, that have thought this way very becoming, and of excellent uſe to quicken Devotion, and excite attention. What may not be ſaid in any caſe by ſuch perſons as theſe, that call this way of Devotion (as he doth) *a taking God's Name in vain*? And what occaſion may others take after the ſame manner, to treat their long Prayers, that are often nauſeous to *ſtanders-by*, for their affected length, and tedious enlargements, and forced Repetitions.

2. He objects, *The* Common-Prayer *Book is guilty of violating the ſacred Word of God:* And here he charges it with no leſs than obliterating, contradicting, adding to it, and detracting from it; and then concludes, *Amongſt men, clipping and corrupting if Coin is Treaſon; and certainly it's a dreadful thing to add to, or take from the Word of God.* Deut. 4. 2. Rev. 22. 19.

And it's *certainly a dreadful thing*; and wo to them that are guilty.

Here I ſhould have expected a rounder Charge by one that had ſo exactly read the Liturgy, and that he would have told the World that we take whole Chapters from the Word of God, and which have no place in our Kalendar, nor are read publickly in the Church,

as I do acknowledge. And ſurely if the omiſſion of one Verſe in a Pſalm, and of Hallelujah in others, be a *taking from the Word of God*; then much more is the omiſſion of whole Chapters; nay, of three whole Books. But he durſt not preſs that too far; for if he had, it would have fallen hard upon ſuch as never have the Scriptures read in their Congregations, tho that was a ſolemn part of Divine Worſhip in the Churches of God, as the Scripture informs us, *Acts* 15.21, *&c.* And if the Church of *Rome* is ſo deſervedly blamed for reading the Scriptures in an unknown tongue, what do they not deſerve that never read them at all in their Congregations? Surely if they had, according to our Saviour's advice, conſidered the Beam in their own eye, they would not have thus magnified the Mote in their Brother's eye. I remember a Queſtion in a Book of the ſame kind with our Author's, *Whether* Proteſtants *do not ſin in defrauding the people of ſome Books and Chapters of Scripture, as well as* Papiſts *in defrauding them of all?* And then what ſort of Proteſtants are they, that with the Church of *Rome*, defraud the people of all, ſo far as the Publick Service of God is concern'd?

A Survey of the Book of Common-Prayer; An. 1610. p. 26.

But to return: Before I ſhall conſider his few Inſtances, that he would make good this Bloody Charge by, I ſhall premiſe a few things.

1. That the Inſtances he offers are, at the worſt, Miſtranſlations, Slips, and Errors, and not chargeable with Perverſeneſs, according to what we charge upon the Church of *Rome*. For here is no intereſt to be ſerved: For what is our Church concern'd, whether it be read as the Liturgical Tranſlation has it, *the 7th Day*; or as the Common Tranſlation, *The Sabbath?* whether as that, *they were not obedient to his word*; or as this, *they rebelled not againſt his word*? whether as that, *The rod of the wicked cometh not into the lot of the righteous*; or as this, *reſteth not*? Whether, as in that, the Titles of ſome Pſalms and Hallelujahs are omitted; or as in this, they are inſerted? Surely here is no intereſt viſible in this, that ſhould incline our Tranſlators of the Pſalter to pick out theſe Texts above all others to make bold with.

2. Miſtranſlations and Errors of this kind, are no ſufficient reaſon for not uſing ſuch a Tranſlation, and much leſs for ſeparating from a Church where they are uſed; for then no Tranſlation could be us'd, or no Church communicated with, becauſe no Church is without ſuch Tranſlations, and no Tranſlation without ſuch Errors. Thus it was in the Church of the *Jews*, when the Septuagint was uſed in publick; Which doth often alter and add to the original *Hebrew*; and yet was not only uſed, but is *quoted* by the *Divine Writers*, even in many places where thoſe Alterations and Additions are. So it alters, *Heb* 10. 5. 11. 21. *Rom.* 10. 18. *Act.* 7. 8. It adds, as *Luk.* 3. 36, 37. *Act.* 7. 14 Then

Then also must not our common Translation be used, which besides the mistakes allowed to be in it, does add in many places, and particularly half a Verse, 1 *John* 2. 23. So it adds the Dates and Subscriptions to the Epistles, Chapters, Verses, and Arguments, throughout the whole, *as if Canonical.* And of this kind are all his Instances.

As (1.) He saith, *The Common-Prayer-Book violates the word of God, as sometimes the words of Scripture are obliterated, and others put in their room. Thus in the Catechism they have changed those words in the Fourth Commandment, the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, into the Seventh day.*

A. We grant it is so; but it's to be remember'd, that it's not so in the 20th of *Exodus*, but in the Liturgy; and if the Liturgy differs from *Exodus*, it's a difference without a distinction, since the Seventh day and Sabbath are all one; and if it differs from *Exodus*, it agrees with the first Institution, *Gen.* 2. 3. where it's said, *God rested on the seventh day, and God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.*

(2.) He saith, *Sometimes the Liturgy makes bold directly and in terms to contradict the Scripture; so* Psalm 105. 28. *it's said they were not rebellious, but the Common-Prayer-Book saith, they were not obedient; and so* Psal. 125. 3.

We grant, That there is a seeming contradiction in words, but not in the meaning of it; for the relative *they* being undetermined, and indifferently to be applied to *Moses* and *Aaron*, or to the *Egyptians*, accordingly is this place to be interpreted; if understood of the former, it's to be read in the common Translation, *they were not rebellious*; if of the latter, it's to be read in the Translation of the Liturgy, *they were not obedient.* And this last reading is according to the present reading of the Septuagint, and some other Translations that follow that. And yet that Translation was generally used by the Primitive Christians, and was worse than any ever used by us. As for Psal. 125. 3. *The rod of the wicked shall not come*, &c. that is, so as to rest there, and so as to tempt them beyond what they are able.

(3.) He saith, *Sometimes the Common-Prayer-Book adds to the Scripture; there are three whole Verses added to the 14th Psalm. And the* Gloria Patri *is frequently added to Scripture, as if it were Canonical.*

Ans. When he saith, That *it is a dreadful thing to add to the word of God*, and charges our Church with it, we might expect some very criminal instances to make it good; and when he saith three whole Verses are added, one would think that this was somewhat invented, and herein inserted by the Church upon some wicked selfish design. But, 1. tho we allow that such Verses are added, yet it's not an addition to Scripture; for tho not found in this place, yet they are in another, *viz. Rom.* 3. 13. and quoted by the Apostle from other

Psalms,

Psalms, *&c.* 2. It's not the common-Prayer-Book that adds, but the Translations which the common-Prayer followed, *viz.* the Septuagint and Vulgar; and tho it was a mistake, yet it's far from being such as incurs the penalty of *Deut.* 4. 2, *&c.*

As for the *Gloria Patri*, I deny that it's added to the Scriptures *as Canonical*, any more than the Contents of the Chapters, the Chapters and Verses of the Bible, or the Dates of the Epistles are; nay, I deny that it's added at all; for any one that can read, will see that it's not inserted in the Psalter, but only rehearsed as the Rubrick directs. And it was for a good end that this was anciently used in the Orthodox Churches of old, and is continued in ours, *viz.* in opposition to the *Arians*, and *Anti-Trinitarians*. *Sozom. l.* 26.

(4). He saith, *Sometimes words are sacrilegiously stolen out of the Bible. As the last Verse is omitted*, Psal. 72. *So are the Scriptural Titles of many Psalms. And I know not how often those words*, Praise ye the Lord, *are left out.*

He durst not trust his Reader with the things left out, for they would have appear'd of so little Consequence, as would have betrayed the weakness of his Cause, as well as his own partiality. That verse omitted, Psal. 72. is this, *the Prayers of David, the Son of Jesse, are ended.* The Titles of the *Psalms* are for the most part such as are no key to the matter of them, and without which the Psalms are as intire as the Chapters without the Contents: The Clause, *praise ye the Lord*, as in the *Hebrew*, *Hallelujah*, and is only left out when it's independent, and has no immediate Relation to the preceding or following Verse. And the reason of these Omissions seems to be, Because the Psalms being to be read in Parts, according to the ancient Custom in *Chrysostom*'s time and before, or chanted, and so read on without naming the Psalms, the Titles, *&c.* would have made a break in that order. And this was done after the manner of Singing the Psalms in the Temple-Service, in which the Titles, and the passage, *the Prayers of David the Son of Jesse, are ended*, were to be sure no part. And so it is in the Singing-Psalms, used by the Dissenters as well as us: And who may as well be charged with such Omissions as we, who there, for the reason aboveſaid, use neither the Verse nor Titles. Surely these Persons are hard put to it, that after such a bloody charge of violating, adding to, and taking from the Word of God, can produce no better proofs and evidences for it, but only that we leave out the Titles and Hallelujah, and that only in the ordinary Service in the publick, where they themselves read it not at all; and when upon the like way of arguing, we may charge them with laying

laying aside the whole Scripture, out of which they read not one Chapter for the information of the People. He goes on,

3. *In the Liturgy the Apocrypha Books are made equal with, nay advanced above the Holy Scripture.* Strange! that a Church should be guilty of this, that in their Articles exclude them out of the Canon; and saith, That they are not read to confirm any Doctrine, but only for informing the Manners. But let us see how he proves this, not by any Assertion of the Church, but some stretches of Arguing. As,

(1.) They are made equal. For *in the Preface to the Common-Prayer, it's said, nothing ordained is to be read but the pure word of God, or that which is evidently grounded on the same. But is the Apocrypha so?*

Here for improving his Argument, he alters the words of the Preface; and for that which is in that, *agreeable to the same*, he reads *evidently grounded on the same*, and then triumphs, *Is the Apocrypha so?* But take it how he will, its evident from hence, that the Apocrypha is so far from being made equal with Scripture, that there is a plain difference between them; for that to which a thing is agreeable, and on which it's grounded, is above that which is agreeable to it, and grounded upon it. A Plea grounded on the law, is surely of less Authority than the Law on which it is grounded. The Apocrypha being read, not for establishing any Doctrine, but for informing the Manners; there is nothing in what is appointed of that kind to be read, but what is agreeable to the word of God, and not contrary to it; and so may be read, as well as their Sermons be heard, which can pretend to no more.

(2.) He saith, *The Liturgy appoints the Apocrypha to be read as Lessons, just as I find it in the Pope's Service-Book, and in a greater proportion than Scripture; for (as some have observ'd) of 172 Apocryphal Chapters, but 38 are omitted. So that these Books are equalized with the pure word of God.*

But surely he doth not find it in our Service-Book, that the Apocrypha Lessons are read for Canonical Scripture, and declared to be so, as they are in the *Pope's Service-Book*; but only as Apocrypha. He that will look for the Apocrypha-Books in the Pope's Bible, as well as Service-Book, will find them mixed with the Canonical, as *Hester* and *Esdras*, &c. but he that will find them in our Bibles, will find them by themselves, and *Apocrypha* in the head of them.

If, as he affirms, the Apocrypha is read in a *greater proportion* than Scripture, it doth more than equalize, and doth rather advance it above the Scripture, and so belongs to his next Assertion, which he would have done well to have reserv'd it to, to make up the proof he is there wanting in.

As

As for what he affirms, that the Apocrypha is read in greater proportion than the Scripture; nothing more falſe. For,

1. All the Second Leſſons throughout the Year, are out of the *New Teſtament*.

2. All Epiſtles and Goſpels read on Sundays and Holy-days, are wholly out of Canonical Scripture.

3. All Firſt Leſſons, on *Sundays* are out of the *Old Teſtament*, and none out of the Apocrypha.

4. On the 33 Holy-days, on the Week-days, there are but 26 Apocrypha Firſt Leſſons, whereas there are 40 out of the Canonical Scripture.

5. When the Apocrypha is appointed to be read in Courſe, it's not clear two Months for Firſt Leſſons, but the Holy Scripture is read all the other Ten Months, and more.

6. Of the 39 Books of the *Old Teſtament*, but 3 are entirely omitted, *viz. Chronicles*, and *Canticles*; but of the 13 of the Apocrypha, 6 are not read at all.

7. Of the 929 Chapters of the *Old Teſtament*, 753 are read in courſe, and 176 only omitted (the reaſons for which generally will appear to the Reader); but out of the 172 Chapters of the Apocrypha, there are (not as he ſaith 38) 66 omitted, and among them that of *Tobit*, that he objects againſt. Where methinks he that pretends to have read and compar'd, ſhou'd have had more value for his own underſtanding, than to be beholding to others, and to ſay *ſome have obſerved*, for there is nothing like a man's own obſervation in matter of Fact.

3. He ſaith, *The Liturgy advanceth the Apocrypha above the Scripture, by intimating that they are more edifying, and can be leſs ſpared than many portions of the Holy Canon; and by ordering them to be read on the higheſt Holy-days, and many of them twice, ſome thrice in one year.*

Methinks in ſuch a round Charge as this, that *the Liturgy advanceth the Apocrypha above Scripture*, he ſhould have had more than an *intimation* for his evidence. He calls it before, High-Treaſon; and ſurely it's very hard to be condemned for it by a bare *Innuendo*; and yet even he fails in his *intimation*. For, 1. if it were true, that the Liturgy order'd the Apocrypha to be read on the *higheſt Holy-days*, and many of them *twice or thrice in the Year*; it would not follow, that they accounted them *more edifying, and leſs to be ſpared* than Scripture; eſpecially when Scripture is read on the higheſt Holy-days, and ſome portions of it twice or thrice in the year too.

2. It's not true, that it's *ordered to be read on the higheſt Holy-days*: For on the higheſt Holy-days, there is nothing but Scripture to be read; ſuch are all the days dedicated to our Saviour, as the Nativity, Circum-

Circumciſion, Epiphany, Good-Friday, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, and all the Lords-days.

3. He ſaith, *Many of them are read twice, ſome thrice in the year.* For the twice, it's only 25 Chapters, *viz.* 7 in *Wiſdom*, and 18 in *Eccleſiaſticus*: And as for his thrice, there is none but the 5th. Chapter of *Wiſdom*, which after it had been read on *the Converſion of St.* Paul, has 17 Verſes of it read on All-Saints. But now, as to the Scripture, the whole *New Teſtament*, except the *Revelation*, is read over thrice in the year in courſe, beſides Epiſtles, Goſpels, and Leſſons out of it on Holy-days. And the *Old Teſtament* is read over once, except as before excepted, in courſe. And many Portions are read again in the Service of *Sundays* and Holy-days, which amount to above 140 Leſſons; and ſome few have a third Courſe.

Would any one that obſerves this, think ſuch a Writer, a Perſon of any care, I had almoſt ſaid Conſcience; that utters as black Slanders as Pen can Write, or Mouth can utter, and charges a whole Church with violating the Word of God, and adding to it, and detracting from it, and of advancing human Writings above it, and yet ſhall come off with changing a Seventh day for Sabbath, with leaving out Hallelujah, with Intimations, and Falſities, with others Obſervations, that pretends to have read and compared, and what not; and after all, charges us with this, for Leſſons appointed to be read in the Publick Congregation, when they themſelves read none at all; and have no other Tranſlation of Scripture, than what was tranſlated by us, and which they uſe in Common with us? This is hard uſage indeed; and if we ſhould retort upon them in the like way, we ſhould think, if we may judge of their value for Scripture by their Publick Service, there are none have a leſs eſteem for it than they, that read not one Chapter of it by way of Leſſon throughout the year, as has been before ſaid.

4. He ſaith, *Such things are enjoyned in the Common-Prayer-Book, as (to my Conſcience) cannot be practiſed without Sin.*

But what is this to thoſe that are not obliged to practiſe them? What is it to Laymen, that the Prieſts are required to give the Holy Communion to all new-married Perſons; or to uſe the Prayers over the Dead; or to put the Ring on in Marriage; or uſe the Surplice, *&c.*?

But what is this which cannot be practiſed without Sin?

1. *Miniſters are requir'd to give the Holy Communion to all new-married Perſons, whereas Marriage-Feſtivals uſed to be accompanied with ſuch Diverſiſements as unfit them. By this Doctrine, all that may Marry, may come to the Lord's Supper, whereas Marriage is An Ordinance which Men as Men*

(and not as Christians only) have a right unto, So that by this Prescription many will eat and drink Damnation to themselves.

Ans. (1.) If this was required, yet it's not inconsistent with that state, which is rightly call'd, *The Holy Estate of Matrimony*; and besides, those Divertisements do not precede but follow.

(2.) Surely those Persons that are married amongst us, are supposed to be Christians, and not to be married meerly as Men.

(3.) If any eat and drink their own Damnation, it's their own fault; and the danger of it doth not release any of their Duty, or justify their neglect of it.

(4.) But the Common-Prayer-Book doth not compel them; it saith only, That *it's convenient at their Marriage, or at the first opportunity after it.*

2. *When any man is buried, the Priest must say, Almighty God has taken to himself the Soul of our dear Brother, perhaps the most wicked Wretch on earth. And that his Body is committed to the Ground, in sure and certain hope of a Resurrection to Eternal Life; tho he did never truly, nor so much as visibly, to the judgment of Charity, repent of his Sins.*

A. (1.) The Office of Burial, supposes that of Visitation of the Sick to go before, where the Minister is appointed to examine, *Whether he repent him truly of his Sins?* &c.

(2.) It supposes the Exercise of Discipline, and that such as he speaks of, have the Censures of the Church exercised on them, which if they be not exercised, we know whom we are to thank for the relaxation of it.

(3.) However, the Church provides not for extraordinary, but ordinary Cases; and if an extraordinary Case happens, and be notorious, no Rule of this nature then binds.

(4.) If it be not notorious, it's safer to err on the charitable side.

(5.) It's not now said, That it's *certain hope of a Resurrection to Eternal Life.*

3. *The putting on the Ring in Marriage, especially the making that Ceremony to be an essential Matter, is Superstition.*

A. (1.) What Superstition can there be in this, more than in joyning of Hands, both of which are Civil Rites, and fit Declarations of pledging their Troth to each other?

(2.) How can that be Essential, which is one of the *alterable* things meant in the Preface?

(3.) It's necessary there should be some Rite used, and some actions by which the espousal should be solemnized, and why not a Ring as well as joyning hands? And why not these as well as others? Therefore *Bucer* calls it, *a very fit Ceremony.* Script. Angl. cens. c. 20.

4. *Churching Women, and their Offerings, is Jewish Superstition.*

A. (1.)

A. (1.) Why Jewiſh? Is there any other Sacrifice than that of Thankſgiving offered? as there was, *Levit* 12. 6.

(2.) What Superſtition is there more in kneeling down at offering up Thanks to God, than in putting up a Bill. However *Bucer* ſaith, *This is agreeable to Scripture*, c. 24.

5. *The Obſervation of Popiſh Holy-days, eſpecially ſuch as are dedicated to Saints, I look upon as highly Superſtitious.*

A. (1.) He looks upon them as ſuch, but how far ſoever his Opinion may paſs with his own Diſciples, yet others expect ſomewhat more.

(2.) Why doth he add Popiſh? Surely he that has read and compared the Popiſh Liturgy with ours, muſt needs know that we have no Holy-days for Popiſh Saints in our Liturgy. As to which, I ſhall refer our Author to Mr. *Perkins* on *Gal.* 4. 10.

6. Of the Surplice, he ſaith, *It's highly Superſtitious. When Holy Veſtments were in uſe among the* Jews, *they had an expreſs Command for them. Should they have made a Mitre or Ephod, or other Eccleſiaſtical Garment of their own heads, they would have ſinned greatly? Witneſs* Judg. 8. 27. *If then the Church of God had no power to appoint Sacred Veſtments, no more has the Church in theſe days.--Moreover the Surplice is immediately borrowed from Idolatrous Maſs-mongers.--Dr.* Abbot (*who was no Fanatick*) *ſaith, That all Prieſtly Garments, whereby Miniſters are diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the Church, are a ſpecial part of the Character of the Beaſt. The Papiſts take the Surplice from* Jews *and* Heathens. *There were Veſtments for the Worſhippers of* Baal, 2 Kings 10. 22. *Biſhop* Jewel *ſaith, The Prieſts of* Iſis *uſed to wear Linnen Surplices. Moreover the greateſt part of our Proteſtant Divines have diſliked this Superſtitious Garment. So Martyr*, &c.

1. His Argument is, the *Jews* had expreſs Command for their Garments, *&c.*

A. (1.) Had the *Jews* no Power to appoint or obſerve any thing relating to Worſhip without expreſs Command? How then came the Feaſts of *Purim* and *Dedication*, the Places and Houſes of Prayer? Nay, whence came the alteration of the poſture at the Paſſover (which our Saviour complied with) contrary to the firſt inſtitution? And ſurely Veſtments are much of the ſame nature with Times and Places, *&c.*

(2.) Suppoſing the *Jews* might not, what is that to us? Yes, ſaith he, *no more can we.* Why ſo? The Apoſtle ſhews we have a Liberty they had not, and we may as well do what they could not, as forbear what they might not. They had not a liberty as we, becauſe under a Schoolmaſter, and of a Temper that needed it, and whoſe Service was Typical. And yet notwithſtanding this, they had a liberty which they might uſe, and much more then have we.

2. The Surplice, he saith, *is immediately borrowed from Idolatrous Mass-mongers.*

A. (1.) What is that, if there be no Idolatry borrowed with it? Do we use it to sanctify Holy-water, Bells, *&c.*?

(2.) As for his Quotation from Dr. *Abbot*, it's a gross mistake, at least; all he saith is, That *the Buyers and Sellers*, Rev. 13. 16. *are the Bishops, Priests, and Monks, that expose to sale Masses and Indulgences, &c. that bind themselves by Oath to the Bishop of* Rome, *and in testimony of it, are divided from the rest of the Church by Rites, Vows, Unctions, Tonsures, Garments.* Where he speaks of Garments in general, and no more of Surplices than Gowns; and of Garments they ordinarily wear, such as belong to Monastick Orders, *&c.* But if he had spoke of all Garments that distinguish the Clergy from the Laity, Dr. *Abbot* had been in that a Fanatick, and not Dr. *Abbot*, who himself wore such Garments, and surely did not think by that, he had a *special Character of the Beast* upon him.

What he quotes from Bishop *Jewel*, is not in that place (if any where) he refers to; neither in the *English* or *Latin* Volume.

3. *The Papists take the Surplice from Jews and Heathens*; and for this latter, quotes the Priests of *Baal.*

A. But the Text doth not say, they were any more White, than Blue or Black; and he might as well have prov'd our Gowns we ordinarily wear, or others prove their Cloaks to be such, as well as he prove our Surplices Heathenish from that Text.

4. He saith, *The greatest part of our Protestant Divines have disliked it.*

A. (1.) What saith he to the *Lutherans*, who all use the like? Are not they Protestants?

(2.) Do any he names dislike it so, as to think it unlawful?

(3.) Do they dislike it so, as to make a Schism in the Church; or for it Separate from a Church?

I am certain these he produces, do declare just contrary. Thus *Pet. Mart. Epist. Amico & Hoopero, &c. Beza Epist. Grindallo. Zanchy Confes.* c. 25. §. 30. *Hemingius in 4 Leg. Decal.* §. 29. &c. *Enchir. tit. Adiaph.* c. 16. *Polanus in Ezek.* 44. And *Zanchy* chuses the Linnen before the Woollen Garment for Divine Offices, as a Sign of Innocence and Holiness, *de Redempt.* c. 16. I could much enlarge the Catalogue of such Testimonies, if it were necessary.

So little did these Learned Men think Mr. *Nichol*'s Argument of any force, which our Author proposes *viz.* 'That all Vestments appropriated to the Worship of God, and appointed for the Signification of Spiritual Duties, by the will of Man, are unlawful. But the 'Surplice is so. This our Author saith is, *Not easy to be confuted.*

But if it be to be answer'd, no matter whether it's not easy in his Opinion. From hence arise two Questions.

Q. 1. Whether it's unlawful to use any thing appropriated to the Worship of God by the Will of Man?

Q. 2. Whether it's unlawful to use any thing in the Worship of God that is appointed for the signification of Spiritual Duties by the Will of man?

By the first it's unlawful for men to appropriate places, or times, or postures to the Worship of God. And so it's necessary, to avoid this Superstition, to make all the Meeting-places to be houses of Merchandise, and to be equally divided between Religious and Common Uses. By the 2d, any thing that has such a Signification applied to it, is made unlawful, by Vertue of such Signification, and which without such Signification would have been lawful. So a Surplice would have been a lawful Garment, if not appropriated, and without Signification; and might have been in its self worn as well as a Cloak, since Custom and Use only makes the difference; but appropriate it, and clap a signification upon it, it's unlawful: And so a Cloak may be turn'd out of Service by the same way. So it's in posture, kneeling and standing are indifferent; but once appropriate kneeling to Prayer, and make it significative, and to be a posture of reverence, and it becomes unlawful. And so without end. So much for Mr. *Nichol*'s Argument, and it's difficulty.

7. Come we now to the Cross, *the greatest Devil amongst all the Idols of* Rome; as he tells us Mr. *Parker sheweth.*

He saith, 1. The first users of it were the Hereticks, *Valentinus* and *Montanus.*

A. That seems hard, when those that wrote against them used it, as *Origen*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Epiphanius* did against the former; and several others against the latter. We find it as ancient as *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, &c.

2. He saith, Mr. *Parker proveth it a sin against all the Commandments, and a breach of the Letter of the second: for men to appoint a Religious Ceremony, is a direct violation of the 2d Commandment, which forbids all human Inventions in Divine Worship, as any part thereof.*

A. There is a way of proving too much, and that any one that reads Mr. *Parker* will soon perceive he doth: And of this I take this Instance of the 2d Commandment to be one, of the letter of which the Author saith, the Cross is a breach. Now the Letter of the Command respects two things; 1. Not to make any Graven Image for Religious Worship. 2. Not to bow down to any such Object.

Now

Now the Croſs uſed in Baptiſm is an *Aerial Croſs*, as he calls it; and where is the Object or the Worſhip? But our Author goes on to prove it after this manner; *for men to appoint*, &c. Here we grant the Propoſition to be true, becauſe God only is to appoint his own Worſhip; and ſo it's not in the power of man to appoint any part of it: But now if Religious Ceremonies may be, and yet not be part of Divine Worſhip, then they are no ſuch human Inventions as are forbidden; and no direct or indirect violation of the 2d Commandment. Therefore it remains upon him to prove the *Croſs a part of Divine Worſhip*: For we ſay it's only an adjunct, and is no more a part of Worſhip, than the ſtriking the Blood upon the Door-poſts was (to make uſe of *Zepperus* his Similitude) or ſitting or kneeling at the Sacrament.

3. He ſaith, *The Arguments which are brought againſt the uſe of Oyl, Cream, Salt, Spittle in Baptiſm (practiſed by the* Papiſts) *hold as well againſt the Croſs.*

Anſ. This I deny; for the Scripture ſpeaks honourably of the Croſs of Chriſt, which this refers to, but not at all of the reſt. Again, the Croſs was traduced and reproached by the *Heathens*, which gave occaſion to the uſe of it, and ſo were not the reſt. So that this was uſed with reaſon; thoſe without it.

His inſtance of the *Gallows* looks ſo prophanely, that I ſhall rather paſs it by, than correct it.

4. He ſaith, *The* Papiſts *adore the Croſs, and it's an Idol*, &c.

Anſ. But do they adore the *Aerial Croſs?* But what is their Adoration (if it were) to us, that do not adore it?

5. *This hath been teſtified againſt by* Zegedinus, Lepperus (it ſhould be *Zepperus*) *Goulartius*, &c.

Anſ. The *Lutheran* Churches uſe it. See *Hemingius*, &c. *Bucer* accounts it *neither indecent, nor unprofitable*, but a Ceremony *of much ſimplicity, and of preſent admonition of the Croſs of Chriſt*; Script. Angl. cenſur. *c.* 12. And generally they account it lawful, and not a ſufficient reaſon for ſeparation; but to be uſed, ſo it be without Superſtition. So *Goulartius* in *Cypr. lib. ad Demetr. c.* 9.

8. His laſt Inſtance of Superſtition is *kneeling at the Sacrament*. Let us conſider what he has to ſay againſt it.

1. He ſaith, *Men pretend in it reverence to Chriſt; but Chriſt himſelf was perſonally preſent, when his Diſciples partook of the Lord's Supper; yet they did not kneel, but uſed the Table-geſture then cuſtomary among the* Jews.

Anſ. (1.) How is he certain the Diſciples did not kneel, but uſed the cuſtomary Poſture in receiving? For the *Jews* in the Paſſover changed Poſtures, and did not throughout keep to that of diſcumbency. See D. *Lightfoot.*

2. The

(2.) The Question is not what they did, but what may lawfully be done? and then the Question is, whether kneeling be unlawful?

(3.) They themselves no more observe our Saviour's Posture, than the *Jews* did that required at the first institution. Our Author words it cautiously, when he saith the Disciples used the Table-gesture *then customary*; for he well knew it was not sitting, but leaning, or lying along, and that they used this by way of signification.

(4.) If the *Table* be the Rule to guide us, then to put on our Hats is suitable, as he knows who reasons.

2. He saith, *Good and Wise men have chosen great sufferings, rather than comply with this Invention.*

Ans. And there were good and wise men that compiled the Liturgy, and used and enjoined this posture; which is an argument he seeks to overthrow, *p.* 16. And as Good and wise men have allowed and approved it; and thought it by no means allowable to separate and break Communion for it. Such as *P. Martyr, Zanchy, Beza, Zepperus*, &c. *Bains, Noyes, Ames, Cartwright*, &c.

3. *In Primitive times Christians did not kneel in the participation of the Eucharist.*

Ans. (1.) It's certain they did not sit, for they had no Notion at all of a Table-gesture, as appears by the use of the Word Altar, and that they counted that a posture of irreverence.

(2.) If they stood (as he saith) on the Lord's-days, their standing was a posture of adoration, to be sure, when they received: So St. *Cyril* expressly, *Catech.* 5.

(3.) It's probable that on other days, when not obliged to stand, that they kneeled; and since they received every day, on six Days they kneel'd; So *Just. Mart. Respons. ad quest.* 115. and that more especially, because they had a Prayer at receiving, as we have.

4. He saith, *It was enjoyned by Pope* Honorius, *being fitted to the Idolatry of* Transubstantiation, *&c.*

Ans. This is a mistake; for *Honorius* did first indeed decree Adoration to the Host, but not kneeling at it. For that is a posture no where enjoyn'd in the Church of *Rome*; and some of them say, it ought to be received standing; but which way, whether sitting, standing, or lying, or kneeling, is not material say others, as the *Pope* himself ordinarily receives sitting, unless he celebrates; and then, as all Priests then do, he receives standing. And all adore not at the receiving, but at the elevation of the Host. Espence-us *de adorat. Eucha. l.* 2. *c.* 16.

5. He saith, *That Religious Worship, which is before a Creature, and with respect to it, having no allowance from God, is against the Commandment; but so is kneeling before the Bread and Wine.* *Ans.*

Anſ. (1.) I queſtion whether God ever allow'd any Religious Worſhip before a Creature, and with reſpect to a Creature; for that is Idolatry, and no allowance from God can be ſuppoſed to Juſtifie or require Idolatry.

(2.) I deny that there is any Religious Worſhip with reſpect to the Bread and Wine; *For* that, ſaith our Rubrick, *were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Chriſtians.* But it's only, as it's there ſaid, *for a ſignification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the Benefits of Chriſt therein given to all worthy receivers.*

6. He draws a Concluſion from the whole, *The* Engliſh *Liturgy is very Corrupt; now to offer to the Lord a Corrupt thing, is evil,* Mal. 1. 13.

Anſ. A corrupt thing there, is what is plainly prohibited: Now let him prove the things before diſputed to be ſuch: As for example, that kneeling is forbidden. As for that place in *Malachi*, I leave to his peruſal the *Letter of the Miniſters of* Old-England *to thoſe in* New-England, *p.* 14. where that is explained.

CHAP. III.

Publick Liturgies of humane Compoſure are an innovation, and deviation from primitive Antiquity: And again, *Set Forms of Prayer deviſed by men are an Innovation.*

FOR this he offers ſeveral Arguments.

1. Saith he, *Had a Liturgy been needful for the edification of the Church, undoubtedly Chriſt, or the Apoſtles by his direction, would have compoſed one, which none of them ever did. And therefore theſe men, who take upon them to compoſe and impoſe a Liturgy on the Churches, aſſume to themſelves more than Apoſtolical Power.*

Anſ. I deny his conſequence: For tho our Saviour and his Apoſtles did, declared and left all things eſſential to a Church, yet there were many things *needful to the edification of the Church* in future Ages that were not expreſly provided for. Our Saviour told the Apoſtles, that *it ſhould be given to them in that hour what they ſhould ſpeak*; and they ſpoke all Languages by preſent infuſion; and ſo were not obliged to think before, or ſtudy or learn a Language; and this was with relation to the preſent condition of the Church in thoſe times. And there are no directions for after Ages to learn Languages, *&c.* So there *was a miraculous gift of Prayer in the Apoſtolical times* (as St. *Chryſoſtom* obſerves, *Hom.* 14. in *Rom.* 8.) and no expreſs directions given about it

it, when that Gift should cease (as he saith it did) and when by the cessation of it, Forms would be necessary. Thus saith *Capellus* (*Thes. Salmur.* Part. 3.) *As soon as miraculous Gifts ceased, and Heretick's began to trouble the Church, there was a necessity for Liturgies.* And therefore Mr. *Ball* saith, *The Christian Churches* for the space of this 1400 years at least, if not from the Apostles times, have had their stinted Liturgies. *Trial*, p. 96, &c. So Letter of Min. of *Old-England*, l. 66, &c.

But this our Author denies, and calls it an Innovation.

And saith, 2. *The Liturgies father'd on the Apostles, and the ancient Writers* (call'd Fathers) *Learned men have evinced to be spurious.*

Ans. (1.) It's granted, that those father'd on the Apostles were so; but tho not the Apostles, yet many of the Prayers in them were antient, and the main of that call'd St. *James*'s, was used in the Church at *Jerusalem*, as Dr. *Comber* [*Original and Use of Liturgies*, p. 97.] in Answer to *Clarkson*, has shew'd from *Cyril*.

(2.) It's certain there was a Liturgy composed by St. *Chrysostom* and *Basil*, and a great part of what is so call'd was certainly theirs; as the aboveſaid Author has shew'd, *p.* 167, 172, 209. and of this mind were * *Mornay* and † *Rivet*. * *Of the Mass*, l. 1. c. 6. † *Censur.* 9. 10.

(3.) The least that can be observed from these Books, is, that when those Books were writ, then Liturgies were in use; so *Dallé*, *We deny not but many of these Liturgies are antient, and written about the beginning of the Fourth Century, tho they were corrupted by Additions and Alterations at several times after their first original.* *De cultu. Lat. l.* 3. *c.* 13.

3. He would prove from an obscure Passage in *Justin Martyr* and *Tertullian*, that there was *no Book of Prayer used by Christians* 200 years after Christ.

Ans. The Passage in *Justin Martyr* is, ὡσαύτως ὅσην ἔχει δύναμιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην ὁ τοῦτο ἀναπέμπων, Which our Author is forced to corrupt, and add to, before he can work it to his purpose; for thus he translates it, *according as strength and utterance was afforded to him from Heaven*: whereas word for word it is, *in like manner he* [the President] *offereth up Prayers to him* [God] *as he has Power*, that is, as fervently as he could: and so the same Phrase a little before. Of this see Dr. *Comber*, *p.* 33, &c. And as little does the Passage in *Tertullian* make for his purpose, which is, That the Christians prayed, *Sine Monitore quia de pectore*; which surely relates not to the praying extempore; for what testimony was that of their Loyalty, more than if they prayed by a Form; but his plain meaning is, they needed no Prompter (as the *Heathens*) but prayed heartily for the Emperors, &c. as their Offices shew'd.

4. He saith, "That there was no Liturgy in some Churches, or in "general use in the Church for above 400 years, is manifest from *So-* "*crates*; who saith, *There were scarcely two Christians found who used* "*the same words in Prayer*, l. 5. c. 21.

Ans. (1.) Here he perverts again: For (1.) *Socrates* doth not say two Christians, but two Churches. (2.) He doth not say, they used the same *words*, but the same *manner*.

(2.) The Words of *Socrates* do not infer what he would have; for he saith, *In Sum: among all Sects you shall scarcely find two Churches agreeing in the manner of Prayer*: Which refers not to the Words, but the Ways, as before described, *viz.* lighting up Candles, *&c.*

(3.) Supposing it was to be understood of the Words, what's that to Extempore Prayer? for they may not have the same words, when yet they may have Forms. The Historian's meaning is, That the Churches had different Forms of Prayer, as well as different Rites: So *Mornay* speaking of the Liturgies of the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches; *Tho in substance the Service of these Churches do agree, yet we must not think there was one and the same Prescript Form observed, and kept in them all.*

Mass. l. 1. c. 6.

5. He saith, *Some plead, that in the* Jewish *Church of old there were Forms of Prayer, besides those of Divine Inspiration; but what was not,* are all *late compositures.*

Ans. 1. If there were Forms of old in the *Jewish* Church, of *Divine Inspiration*, and those Forms to be used (as the Scripture shews) then it shews that Forms may lawfully be used.

2. That the *Jews* had set-forms of human composure, of ancient times, Learned men agree; So *Mornay* shews; and that the *First-Christians framed themselves after this manner of Service.*

So Mornay *Mass.* l. 1. p. 19.

3. Nay, Learned men observe, that Forms were used in our Saviour's time; and yet he is so far from condemning them, that he attended their Service, and composed a form like to theirs. So Dr. *Lightfoot.*

Vol. 1. 157, 158, 161.

So that we see he has failed throughout in his attempt of proving Liturgies and set-forms an Innovation. But I can tell *what is an Innovation*; and that is, To hold Liturgies unlawful.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

It's an Apostacy in this Age of Light, to countenance or comply with the Common-Prayer-*Book Worship.*

UPON this his chief Topick is:

That Good and Learned men have born witness against the Corruptions of the English *Liturgy, and chose to suffer rather than comply with it.*

Ans. 1. There have been as Good and Learned men that have shew'd those not to be Corruptions.

2. There have been several of his Learned and Good men, who he saith, *chose rather to suffer, than sin, by complying with the Liturgy*, that have shew'd those Corruptions not to be a sufficient reason for Separation: So Mr. *Bradsham*, Mr. *Nicols*, &c.

3. They were so far from refusing Communion for them, that the Old *Nonconformists ordinarily and constantly used the Common-Prayer-Book in their publick Ministrations*; as Mr. *Ball*, one of them, declares, *Tryal*, p. 121, 155.

4. All of them testified against the *Brownists*, and against a separation from the Church. *It was* (saith Mr. *Baxter*) *the Parish-Churches that had the Liturgy, which Mr.* Jacob *the Father of the Congregational Party wrote for communion with. The same I may say of Mr.* Bradshaw, *Dr.* Ames, *and other Nonconformists, whom the Congregational Brethren think more favourable to their way.*

In the close, our Author offers some farther Objections from *the false and corrupt Doctrine* he pretends to find in the Liturgy.

(1.) As, that *it's certain by God's word, that Children Baptized dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved: This*, saith he, *savours of* Pelagianism.

Ans. I don't understand the falseness, or Pelagianism of it. It's certain by God's Word, that *of such is the Kingdom of God*, and so they must be capable of it. If capable of it, it must be upon Gospel terms; but what terms they are capable of but Baptism, I understand not.

(2.) That *there are two Sacraments necessary to Salvation; which implies a double Error*, viz. *that the Sacraments are necessary to Salvation; and that there are more Sacraments of the New-Testament than two.*

Ans. I don't see wherein is the first Error, if he had truly represented it; for it's said in the Catechism, two Sacraments *generally* necessary; that is, that they are a Duty belonging to all persons that

are capable of it; where there are persons to baptize, and a Congregation to communicate with; and therefore it's not said absolutely, but *generally* necessary.

As for the latter, a Sacrament is not a Scripture-word, but a Term of Art, and so hath been variously used and applied; and therefore to set out what it means, the Church has defined what a Sacrament is, and then shew'd there are but two: and so this Phrase is used to distinguish it from any other so called; and that then none but these two are generally necessary to all Christians.

(3.) *The Book saith, Some Sins are deadly, as if the Popish distinction of sins into Mortal and Venial, were a sound distinction.*

Ans. How can that be, when Fornication, which is called deadly in the Liturgy, in the Church of *Rome* is ordinarily accounted a Venial Sin; and when the distinction between Mortal and Venial (as used in the Church of *Rome*) is so contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*? It's plain that our Church means thereby no other than *heinous*.

(4.) It's said, *Christ has redeemed all mankind.*

Ans. The Scripture saith, *God will have all men to be saved*; and that *Christ died for all*, &c.

2. He argues farther, That *a stinted Liturgy, is opposite to the Spirit of Prayer*, Eph. 6. 18.

Ans. (1.) If so, then the Spirit will not communicate it self in a Liturgy, or stinted Form of Prayer, contrary to the sense of all sober Divines. So Dr. *Owen*: *Supposing*, saith he, *those who make use of, and plead for Forms of Prayer, especially in publick, do in a due manner prepare themselves for it by holy meditation*, &c. *I do not judge that there is any such evil in them, as that God will not communicate his Spirit to any in the use of them.*

Discourse of prayer, P. 31.

(2.) If so, then *almost all Churches in the world for these* 1300 *years, at least, to this day* (as Mr. *Baxter* allows) have been without the Spirit of Prayer.

Sacrileg. desert. p. 102, &c.

(3.) If so, then we cannot lawfully communicate in, or with a stinted Liturgy, which has yet *been approved by all Reformed Churches*, as Mr. *Ball* saith; and Mr. *Norton* saith it's *lawful to embrace Communion with Churches, where such Forms in Publick worship are in use.*

Apol. c. 13.

(4.) As for *Eph.* 6. 18. that we are to *pray with all Prayer*; why is that not possible by a Liturgy, when there are in it Supplications, Prayers, and giving of thanks?

3. He lets pass the Argument, from the mischief of a prescript Liturgy, and so will I pass what follows from the trivial, unintelligible, and dirty Reflections of it. For he knows we can match his

Fidler,

Fidler with Stories of some of those that have been Eminent the other way, and could argue upon the sinfulness of unpremeditated and conceived Prayer.

3. He saith, Mr. *Cotton* speaketh weightily, in saying, *It's unlawful to bring ordinarily any other Book into the Publick Worship of God, besides the Book of God.*

A. I know no difference between Reading and Reciting in this case; and I have heard Mr. *Cotton* used a Form of Prayer in the Pulpit. If he did not, yet all the Nonconformists in former times did, as far as ever I could learn. *See* Clerk's *Collect. of Lives*, p. 38.

To close all; he undertakes to Answer an Objection, That *Good men were the first Collectors and Publishers of the Liturgy, and died Martyrs.*

This he endeavours to answer; and yet when it's to serve his own Cause, it's a considerable Argument. Thus saith he before, *The Corruptions of the Liturgy have been born witness against by good Men; and his Father, a Holy Man, suffered much for his Nonconformity*, and what not. Now surely, if this sort of arguing is good for them, it's good for us.

But he Replies further,

1. *All Persons employed in it, were not good Men, as* Day *Bishop of* Chichester. *He was a dissembling Hypocrite, pretending to be a Protestant, but afterwards shew'd himself to be a Papist.*

A. Here he betrays gross ignorance, or somewhat worse. For tho *Day* was one of the 18 Bishops imployed for compiling the Service-Book at first, *Anno* 1548. yet at that time he was for Transubstantiation, and Solitary Masses, and against having the Service in the Vulgar Tongue. Burnet's *Reformat. Part* 2. p. 62. *and Num.* 25.

And when the next Review was, which was 1550. when *Cranmer* wrote to *Bucer* about it, it does not appear that *Day* was concerned; nay, rather that he was against it, for he refused to set his hand to the Book, before it was enacted by a Law; and was afterward turn'd out of his Bishoprick, and depriv'd. But to say all in a word, What was this *dissembling* Hypocrite to those who *were truly Pious Men, and acted faithfully according to the Light they had?* as our Author acknowledgeth. *Ibid.* p. 163. p. 203.

2. He saith, Good men chang'd their minds, so did *Ridley* and *Cranmer*.

A. Both gross mistakes. For Archbishop *Cranmer* took upon him to defend the Common-Prayer, Ministration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, when in Prison. Fox's *Acts and Monuments*, Fol. 1465.

And

And Biſhop *Ridley*, a little before his Martyrdom, in a Letter to his Friend, ſaith, *This Church had of late the whole Divine Service, all Common and Publick Prayers, framed to the true vein of Holy Scripture.*

Fox's Acts and Monuments, Vol. 2. p. 1940.

And again, after his condemnation, writing an Anſwer to *Grindal*, concerning *Knox*'s peremptory Exceptions againſt the Service-Book; *I grant*, ſaith he, *a Man (as he is) of Wit and Learning, may find apparent reaſons; yet I ſuppoſe he cannot ſoundly by the Word of God ſo diſprove any thing in it.*

Vide Dr. Taylor. Fox Martyr. p. 1521.

3. He ſaith, *Others were much troubled at the Service-Book*; as Biſhop *Hooper*, and Mr. *Rogers* at home; and *Calvin*, *Bucer*, *Martyr*, *Bullinger*, &c. abroad. So *Alaſco*, and *Knox*, and the firſt Reformers in *Scotland*.

A. As for *Hooper*'s diſſatisfaction, it was not at the Liturgy, but the Epiſcopal Veſtments; in which alſo he at laſt complied.

Vide Burnet, p. 125 &c. 166.

And as for *Bucer*'s mind, and *Pet. Martyr*'s, the *Engliſh* Reader will find it in the Hiſtory of the Reformation, *p.* 154, 155. And *Calvin* to the *Engliſh* Exiles at *Frankford*, declares againſt a rigorous Oppoſition, and was pleaſed that he retained Moderation in this Caſe.

Epiſt. 200 and 206. and 228. That of Alaſco, printed Anno 1550. And that of Knox at Middelb. 1594.

As for *Alaſco* and *Knox*, whatever they objected againſt the Liturgy, yet both had their Publick Offices, and Forms of Prayer.

4. He ſaith, *In Queen* Elizabeth's *time the Biſhops made the Common-Prayer-Book in ſeveral things worſe, and more intollerable, than it was in the days of King* Edward 6.

A. 1. And I hope he will confeſs in many things better.

2. Why thoſe Prayers, *&c.* were left out, he may ſee in the Hiſtory of the Reformation, *p.* 77, 170, 392.

The reaſon of which has been before juſtified.

3. There could be no great alteration to the worſe, if that was all that he mentions; and however is nothing to us, when the Rubrick of the Communion is reſtored.

And now, that he may end as he begun, as he would have our Service-Book come from Popery; ſo he will have it, *That time will diſcover that ſome, who pretend Zeal for the Common-Prayer-Book, are carrying on a deſign for* Rome.

And time has diſcovered, that ſome of thoſe who pretended Zeal againſt the Common-Prayer, carried on a deſign for *Rome*, and helped them forward in it, or ſtood as it were Neuters; and that the Liturgy has not ſo much a tendency that way, as Separation.

The World ſaw it in the late Reign, and found that the Church that uſes the Liturgy, was a Bulwark againſt Popery; and when thoſe that were againſt the Liturgy, either baſely complied, fawn'd upon it, or cowardly were ſilent.

The

THe Second Queſtion.

Q. 2. *What reaſon have you to ſcruple the lawfulneſs of laying the Hand on the Book, and Kiſſing the Book in Swearing?*

To this he Anſwers,

1. *We do not find in the Scripture the Lord's Servants were wont to ſwear after this manner; we read of lifting up the hand,* &c. *which is a natural ſign of Worſhip.*

A. 1. We find in Scripture, that they were wont to put the hand under the Thigh in ſwearing; And thus the ſame *Abraham* that lift up his hand, required his Servant to ſwear, by putting his hand under his Thigh, *Gen.* 24. 2. and ſo *Jacob* made his Son *Joſeph* to uſe the ſame Ceremony when he ſwore, *Gen.* 47. 29. Now what natural Sign of Worſhip was in this Rite?

2. Since we find different Rites us'd, it's a ſign that practice of the Lord's Servants is to be no Rule to us in this matter; but that we are to govern our ſelves by the Cuſtom of the place where, and the People among whom we live, if there be nothing in it ſelf unlawful.

3. He ſaith, and ſeems to allow it, That the *Romans* of old, and *Italians*, and *Spaniards*, uſe to lift up the Finger when they ſwear ſolemnly. Now I conceive lifting up the Finger is no natural Sign of Worſhip. And if it had any ſignification, I know no reaſon why the *Germans* may not lift up three Fingers; to intimate they invoke the Sacred Trinity, which he ſaith, he *cannot juſtify*. Nor why we may not lay the Hand upon, and Kiſs the Book, in token of belief of it, and of our acting according to it, and of our being judged according to it.

For the Word of God doth not preſcribe in ſuch caſes.

2. He anſwers, *Laying the Hand on the Book is a ſymbolizing with Popiſh Idolaters, and Superſtitious* Jews.

A. 1. It's not a ſymbolizing with Papiſts as ſuch; ſince there are Papiſts that uſe other Ceremonies in ſwearing, as he ſaith, The *Italians*, *Spaniards*, and *Germans* do. And therefore, if this be a reaſon, as we muſt not lift up the Fingers, becauſe they do ſo; ſo we muſt not lift up the Hand, becauſe that is not to be done, but we muſt lift up the Fingers too.

2. If it was cuſtomary among the *Jews* to produce the Law in giving an Oath, I ſee no reaſon to condemn it; and ſo know no hurt to obſerve it. They uſed alſo to adjure Perſons, and our Saviour readily anſwers to it, when thus call'd upon.

3. He

3. He replies, *Kissing in a Religious way, is a gesture of Adoration.* And he closes it, *This is clearly to Worship a Book; and so to give up to a Creature that Honour which is due to God alone.* And before he saith, *So help you and the Contents of this Book; is not much better than when the Papists say, So help me God, and these Holy Evangelists, which is gross Idolatry.*

A. That Kissing may be a Token of Adoration, when the thing kiss'd is an Object of Adoration, is acknowledged. But it's not a token of Adoration, when the thing kissed is not an Object of Adoration. Thus kissing the Calves, and an Image, is an act of Adoration, because the Object is an Object of Adoration; but kissing the Book is not, because a Book is no Object of Adoration.

If it be asked, Why then is the Book kissed? I say, it's in token of Reverence, as it's the Book of God; and which, if I so kiss every time I read it, it's surely far from being Idolatry. And that this so, appears from what follows, *So help me God, and the Contents of this Book*; which is in different ways, God by his Grace, and the Contents of this Book by their Instruction; the one as the efficient, the other the Instrumental cause. And thus without doubt it's meant in the old Form, *So help me God, and these Holy Evangelists*, that is, the Gospel wrote by them; as the name of *Moses* is given in Scripture to his Writings. So that in this sence it's neither Idolatry in them, nor any thing like it in us. And we may as lawfully kiss the Book, as lift up the Hand, since neither of them are prohibited by God's Law; and so being indifferent in themselves, we may act as the case requires.

FINIS.